

**NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS**  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

721 Route 202-206  
P.O. Box 1018  
Somerville, NJ 08876-1018  
(908) 722-0700  
Facsimile: (908) 722-0755

**JAN 17 2006**

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

January 17, 2006

TO: Examiner Luke S. Wassum, Group Art Unit 2167  
TELEFAX NUMBER: 571-273-8300  
PHONE NUMBER: 571-272-4119  
COMPANY/FIRM: U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

FROM: Davy E. Zoneraich, Esq.  
Client/Matter Name:  
Client/Matter Number: 102916-001US, U.S. Appln. No. 10/756,986

**MESSAGE:**

We are transmitting 8 pages, including cover page(s). If the transmission is not complete, please call (908) 722-0700 extension 254 and ask for Lori Andrews.

The original of this transmittal document will be sent by:

Ordinary Mail	E-Mail
Messenger	Overnight Mail

x This is the only form of delivery for this document to your department

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

New York Office: 220 East 42nd Street, 30th Floor, New York, NY 10017  
Telephone: (212) 808-0700 Facsimile: (212) 808-0844

JAN 17 2006

Doc Code:

PTOL-413A (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/756,986 First Named Applicant: Shirish Phatak  
 Examiner: Luke S. Wassum Art Unit: 2167 Status of Application: Final Rejection

## Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Luke Wassum (2) Shirish Phatak  
 (3) Davy Zoneraich, Esq. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 1/19/06 Proposed Time: 2:00 (AM/PM)

## Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims / Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Section 103</u>	<u>Claims 1,15</u> (Fig. 1)	<u>Stiles</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Section 103</u>	<u>Claim 1</u>	<u>Barbara, McClain</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>Section 103</u>	<u>Claims 17,18</u>	<u>Stiles, Rao</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

## Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See attached

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Davy Zoneraich  
 Applicant / Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner / SPE Signature

Davy E. Zoneraich

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

37,267

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

§ 103 Rejection of independent claims 1 and 15

Stiles does not teach method and system for providing shared access to data files using a storage cache that is "for associating with at a plurality of first authorized computer workstations." The "client cache" in Stiles exists for each client, in other words, each client has its own client cache which serves as the client's memory, such that the Stiles client cache is not the same as the claimed "storage cache". Nowhere does Stiles teach or suggest that a client cache is for associating with a plurality of workstations, so as to provide an interface between the plurality of workstations and the file server via the cache server.

In summary, the Stiles client cache does not, and cannot, maintain a current version of a cached data file therein, based on data file modifications entered by any one of a plurality of associated clients (workstations), because only a single client can be associated with the client cache in Stiles.

§ 103 Rejection of independent claim 11

See above arguments concerning requirements for the claimed storage cache, which are not taught or suggested in the cited references. In particular, Barbara *et al.* does not teach the storage cache, as claimed.

§ 103 Rejection of independent claims 17 and 18

See above arguments concerning requirements for the claimed storage cache and distinguishing Stiles. Also, the "atomic" read privileges in Rao *et al.* are not the same as the claimed reader rights. Reader rights according to the claimed invention do not require "waiting", *i.e.*, there is an immediate right to view a file. (See application, pg. 10). In contrast, the atomic read rights of Rao *et al.* require a "wait" (see Rao *et al.*, Col. 15, ln. 51-55).